12

Some Consequences of the Assumption of Death

Anthony David Vernon

Lingering Shadows A Literary Journey into Memory and Death: pages 127 - 134

There is one assumption that is arguably the most common amongst all assumptions, that to live is to die, that to join the living means that one shall join the dead. This assumption will be denoted as the assumption of death. No matter how well grounded this assumption of death may seem to be; it is still an assumption nonetheless. Though the assumption of death is not universal among all humans; the assumption of death is extremely commonplace to the point of near universality. This paper shall showcase some of the consequences of taking on the assumption of death as a held belief. The assumption of death has permeated all aspects of human society be they thought, cultural, linguistic, and so on. The assumption of death has come to be unblinkingly accepted by many as an absolute outright and perhaps even as the outright absolute. That is our one epistemological certainty is that for the living their death will most certainly come about. Yet, there are a myriad of reasons to question the outright absolute certainty of the assumption of death. But this piece is not to call death into question even though there is plenty of room to do so. Rather, for those who take on the assumption of death what are the consequential results. There are far too many consequences to name and discuss meaningfully for the purposes of this piece. So, I shall highlight a few important consequences, the ending of guilt, finite cultures, the meaning legacy, and epistemological dominos along with how they are tied together. Each of these terms may appear as dangling words so may seem hazy but each shall be defined and shown to be in strong connection with not only the assumption of death but

an ideology.

Death allows for the ending of guilt. Once one is dead their guilt vanishes with them. So, for those who hold onto the assumption of death there is no need for guilt, all guilt shall come to an end with death. Because of death guilt becomes inevitability shed by the very forces of nature itself. Even if one is unable to shed their own guilt, death will do the shedding for them. To those who believe in the assumption of death guilt loses a great deal of importance. One's guilt does not outlive their death, but is only a product of life that comes to an end with death. This dramatically differs from those who have an immortal outlook. The immortal will always live with their guilt, will always have to carry their guilt until they are hopefully able to themselves shed off their own guilt. The immortal cannot wait for some outside force to rid them of their guilt; they must face their guilt themselves. While it may seem on the surface that those who believe in death face guilt better than the immortal, the opposite is the case. Belief in death equals a stronger tendency to repress guilt, to ignore guilt, to let guilt fester. After all, why face guilt, a quite challenging thing to face, when death can face guilt for you. For the immortal, one alone can only face guilt. For the immortal guilt may be an immortal burden, so it is all the more important to lose that burden as soon as possible so one is not managing that burden for immense and possibly unending periods of time. But those who take on the assumption of death have a fallback and excuse to not face guilt. Why bother facing guilt when life is short and death shall come. Belief in death consequently makes the managing of guilt far more difficult. This is obviously not to say that one who believes in the assumption of death cannot handle guilt well. It is simply to state that as a consequence of taking on the assumption of death the prospect of facing guilt becomes less likely therefore more difficult. This less likelihood to face guilt also in turn makes facing guilt, when or if the confrontation does occur, far more difficult. Repressed and festering guilt only grows while mutating. While, this is also an issue for the immortal and perhaps even more so, those who take on the assumption of death are more likely to hold repressed festering guilt. For the believers in the assumption of death, guilt grows into a monster to be killed, for they understand their own psychology in terms of death. Yet, guilt only appears to be a monster and only appears more monstrous with greater repression along with longer festering. Those who believe in death are more ready to act on and upon an attempt to kill their guilt. But guilt, which is more readily understood by the immortal, guilt is not a monster but a burden to be unloaded. Those who believe in death are more ready to believe in outside forces acting upon them, more ready to view guilt as an exterior force. But guilt is a burden we take on ourselves, that we cannot bring death to for the guilt will have always been there. Rather, guilt can only be left behind but never eliminated. The believers in the assumption are ready to eliminate and exterminate so thus cannot face a force properly that cannot be wiped out. That is why often those who take on the assumption of death let death take on their guilt, they think another outside force will best handle an outside force. To summarize simply, those who hold the assumption are more likely to repress guilt, let guilt fester, view guilt as an exterior force, and are less likely to confront their guilt as a consequence of their held belief in the assumption of death.

Hoards of cultural pieces whether they are popular or not showcase death as a prominent

theme. Death, even when not a theme it is still made use of as a literary device or can even underline a narrative. There is no need to name examples, so many exist now and will continue to be created. This prominence of death in human culture says something quite important about human culture. Humanity possesses a finite culture. The themes and the ideas stressed by humanity for the most part are finite themes. Humanity seeks satisfying endings because they expect endings and those endings might as well be satisfying. Yet, cultural pieces are not inherently bound to stress ending and finitude. Yes, while books can only be so long and paintings can only be so large, no cultural piece has to have finitude as a theme. There is the possibility of having an infinite culture. An infinite culture would emphasize the ever ongoing and the endless. Arguably an infinite culture would be far richer than a finite culture because an infinite culture cannot be exhausted. However, an infinite culture is quite unlikely if not impossible to occur amongst beings that hold onto the assumption of death. For those who believe in the inevitability of death will reflect this belief in their cultural pieces. Those who think all things will come to an end will bring all things to an end. What other way could there be? It is plainly obvious to those who believe in the assumption of death that death is an ever present and inevitable force. So therefore, death must underline anything that ever occurs or at least be possible at any moment. In other words, those who believe in the assumption of death not only cannot imagine the infinite well or even at all but also reject the infinite as a possibility. Thus, it is not very possible for these believers' cultural pieces to have infinite themes. A culture that believes in its own death cannot be infinite. A culture tied to the assumption of death can and will only ever be a finite culture. Cultures with the assumption of death as a belief will be a culture limited due to limiting itself via setting limitations upon the possible. A finite culture can only express so much because it can have its own set parameters that only go so far. Disbelief in the assumption of death does not automatically equal an infinite culture. Still, those beings unbounded by the assumption of death can very possibly have infinite cultures whose themes are not about the management of endings or demises but the forging of ever new beginnings.

The outlook of what legacy is drastically shaped by one's understanding of death. For those who hold onto the assumption of death, legacy exists as a matter of memory. It is those who are remembered by living that have legacy. So it follows that those who are remembered by the largest number of people for the longest period of time have a greatest legacy. This means that Alexander The Great has a greater legacy than your grandfather. For it is quite unlikely that your specific grandfather is not known by more people than Alexander The Great. It is also impossible that your grandfather has been in the memory of humanity longer than Alexander The Great. Now this is not a straightforward equation but a general idea especially since every person has memories of different occurrences. Nonetheless, those believers in the assumption of death hold the general framework of legacy as a matter of memory nearly universally. Yet, there are obvious problems with this outlook. If an individual is not being remembered by anyone at that moment is his, her, or their legacy on hiatus? If an individual is no longer recalled by anyone does his, her, or their legacy simply vanish or is it just lost? Treating legacy as a matter of memory reduces legacy to a matter of psychology which weakens what legacy is. If legacy is

reduced as a matter of memory it is flimsy and open to rapid violent shifts. One's legacy as memory can be reshaped in favor of the whims of those who wish to exert false memories. One's legacy as memory can more simply be reshaped by a lapse in memory whether it be a commonplace lapse or from a deterioration of the mind. In other words, legacy in this case is knotted to the inconsistency of memory. Both mass memory and individual memory are inconsistent. But surely one's legacy cannot be a false memory. How can one's legacy be something that they did not go about? So why does memory hold such esteem in matters of legacy? What does it matter to you that more people remember Alexander The Great than your grandfather? The believers in the assumption of death tie legacy to memory because they believe all things must come to an end but that there is still value in making yourself exist as long as possible in some way. Yet, for believers in universal immortality they already believe that everyone has immortality so no one can make themselves last longer than anyone else. The immortal do not ignore that anyone else is more or less remembered than anyone else. Yet, for the immortal legacy is not a matter of memory but a matter of impact. And once has impacted one will have always impacted. An impact cannot be wiped like a memory can for once something hits the hit will always be there. With legacy as a matter of impact shows every being from gods to peasant farmers to bacteria has a legacy. Every action is an impact from a panther's step to a president's executive order. Yes, some impacts are more impactful, but in this case all beings have a legacy for all beings to have an impact. By being present alone an impact is made. Yet, the believers in inevitable death have trouble imagining themselves as a product of ever present impacts. Certainly, the impacts of grandfather shall vanish. But this not so, from a particular framework legacy cannot vanish or be altered. Legacy from the immortal outlook as a matter of impact will have always hit how it hit and it doesn't matter how that impact is recalled. The recollection of impact is not legacy that is simply storytelling. Legacy for the holders of the assumption of death is a narrative told about something perceived as gone. Stories are not only open to adaptation but are also open to be remembered incorrectly. As a consequence of believing in the assumption of death one is likely to hold onto a flimsy narrative of another as their understanding of legacy.

As with any assumption there are epistemological implications that come with taking on a belief in the assumption of death. Believing in the assumption of death fully not only has epistemological implications in and of itself but also comes with a tumbling of epistemological dominos. In other words, taking on the assumption of death as a certainty rather than an assumption not only affects one's view of knowledge surrounding death but also causes one to peg other epistemological items as certain knowledge. To begin with, taking on the notion that to live is to die is a certain absolute outright truly unquestionable fact already establishes a clearly anti-skeptic position. As one holding this can claim to know something and therefore know that knowledge can be had along with knowing that knowledge is an existent thing. This is the first epistemological domino to fall from taking on the assumption of death, a domino of anti-skepticism and knowledge certainty. But if one thing can be known there is at least a likelihood that other things can be known. Of course, this does not necessarily follow, as often

people will claim that death is the only certainty. But no matter what one claims other dominos must fall if one claims that living guarantees death. One must have knowledge that life is an existent thing and secondly that life is an existent thing that is bound to death as one of its features. Not only do the assumption makers of death know that there is life, they also know a characteristic about life. More dominos have fallen which crash into death. These assumers of death must know about death. Foremost that death is an existent thing and secondly that death has a function, that function being to end life. Already by taking on one assumption as knowledge we can quickly see how other knowledge claims must follow. I could emphasize redundancy in other epistemological dominos such those who hold onto the assumption of death claim to know about existence, ends, mortality, immortality, decay, and so forth necessarily from that very held position. More importantly than knowing what specific dominos are falling it is of much greater importance to understand the implications of falling dominos. The falling of dominos allows for the establishment of grand and mini frameworks. Standing dominos only exist as an obstacle, but falling dominos create an image and can be cleared more easily. Or in no metaphorical terms, once one holds something to be knowledge they can use that as a foundation to build a system of knowledge which allows one to organize the information of the cosmos into a framework or frameworks. The most common starting block is taking on the assumption of death as knowledge. On a mass scale the epistemological implication of this means most if not all of our knowledge is built up on the idea that living guarantees death. In other words, our framework and frameworks of understanding begin with the guarantee of death. Thus our pursuit of knowledge can never escape death but is bound to and bound by death. We have not been knocking down dominoes in different directions but rather stacking dominos. Taking on one piece of information as knowledge shapes all other pieces of knowledge. Taking on one thing as knowledge reshapes the whole understanding of reality no matter how simple it may appear on the surface. The seeming obviousness of the assumption of death has allowed for the assumption of death to be the most popular of ideologies. This ideology has deeply shaped humanity, all human actions are shaped by death in one form or another. We have let the ideology of the death lord over us. Death can be found almost everywhere in our psychology, in our culture, and in our understanding of ourselves to name a few already mentioned areas. Death is the most dangerous of ideologies and it is an all consuming ideology. For death is the elimination of existence. Who exists without epistemology? That is not the issue at play. Rather, there are severe and literally deadly implications to taking on the deadliest ideology of all time. An ideology that assumes death not only as an inevitability but also an unbeatable force. Taking on the assumption of death is an immediate and direct pipeline into the most dangerous of all the ideologies. What could be a more concerning epistemological implication?

Some consequences of taking on the assumption of death as outright knowledge have been laid out. One, that the taking on of the assumption of death allows one to abandon the confrontation of their guilt. Also, that belief in the assumption of death shapes one understanding of legacy as a matter of memory. Along with that cultures that believe in the assumption of death are finite cultures that celebrate finite things. All this stems from the same epistemological

position which culminates together to assist in forming the most dangerous and deadly of all ideologies. An ideology that is guiltless, where the only thing that matters is one's memory, and promotes finitude. A culture that takes on this ideology regularly and readily breeds those that will bring about death. And not just bring about death upon oneself but also upon others. The consequences of accepting death as an unbeatable inevitability is of course more death. What else could follow? If death is to come to all at some point guaranteed, why not bring it about? Unblinkingly the most dangerous of all ideas has come to be accepted by almost all. Countless deaths can be accredited to this idea alone and they shall never be accredited to the assumption so therefore will remain countless.

Contents

Preface v

1. Death in a Lonely Place: The Loneliness of Modern Dying in the Bathrooms of *Bates Motel and 13 Reasons Why* 1
—Denis Newiak

2. Anchored on Dead Bodies: A New Narrative Frame for Framing Violence on Tamil Society in Shobasakthi's *Gorilla* and *Traitor* 23
—Vihanga Perera

3. Investigating the (Dead) Body in Anna Katharine Green's *That Affair Next Door* 36
—Nina Marie Voigt

4. Gregory of NIN – The Historical Figure in Croatian National Consciousness 45
— Domagoj Krpan

5. Tales of Violence and Loss of Independence and Shared Common Memory: A Case of Second Letter from *Cartas y Relaciones de Hernán Cortés al Emperador Carlos V*[1] 55
—Dr. Sabyasachi Mishra

6. Accumulation of Episodic Experiences: A History of the Humshira from Khalid Mohamed's *The Aladia Sisters* 63
—Ms. Rashmi Bhura, Dr. Mekhala Venkatesh

7. Partition and Memory Studies:A Comparative Study of Gendered Violence and Traumatic Memories in the Select Partition Fiction 72
—Ms. Neelofar Shafi, Peerzada Owais Adil

8. Retrieving Autobiographical Memory in Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni's *The Palace of Illusion* 82
—Dr. Divya Mishra

9. "Through The Stories We Hear Who We Are": *Re-membering* the 'Self' through Reception, Resistance, and Remembrance 92
—Rhitama Basak

10. Plurality of Trauma: An Analytical Study of Rohinton Mistry's Fine Balance 107
—Dr. Priti Bala Sharma

11. Beyond Mortality-Exploring the Philosophical Connotation of Death 117
—Dr. Sreeja Das, Dr. Rahul Varma

12. Some Consequences of the Assumption of Death 127
—Anthony David Vernon

13. Critical Analysis of Margaret Atwood's *Surfacing* as Death and Memory Narrative 135
—Dr. Parul Mishra

14. Pashtun Characters in Fatima Bhutto's *The Shadow of the Crescent Moon*: A Study of the Novel 141
—Dr. Abrar Ahmed

List of Contributors 156